

A comparative study of correlations between arrival directions of ultra-high-energy cosmic rays and positions of their potential astrophysical sources

D. S. Gorbunov¹, S. V. Troitsky^{1,2}

¹ *Institute for Nuclear Research of the Russian Academy of Sciences,
60th October Anniversary Prospect 7a, 117312, Moscow, Russia*

² *Service de Physique Théorique, CP 225,
Université Libre de Bruxelles, B-1050, Brussels, Belgium*

Abstract

We consider various classes of persistent extragalactic astrophysical sources which have been suggested in literature as possible emitters of ultra-high-energy cosmic rays (UHECR). We compare the strength of the claimed correlations by a uniform procedure for all classes of sources by making use of the AGASA, Yakutsk and HiRes stereo data. BL Lac type objects correlate with the cosmic rays detected by all three independent experiments and are more probably, compared to other astrophysical sources, related to the UHECR origin. With the account of the Galactic magnetic field (not possible for the HiRes data at the moment), apart of BL Lac type objects, unidentified gamma-ray sources may be correlated with AGASA and Yakutsk cosmic rays.

1 Introduction

Thousands of cosmic rays with energies higher than 10^{19} eV have been detected by various experiments. Still, the origin of these energetic particles remains unknown. Deflections of charged particles by cosmic magnetic fields are relatively small (though significant) at these energies; moreover, presence of a fraction of neutral particles, which propagate rectilinearly, is not excluded. This opens a possibility for direct searches of astrophysical sources of the high-energy cosmic rays by positional correlations.

Several difficulties limit the application of this approach. Firstly, at least a large fraction of air showers with $E \gtrsim 10^{19}$ eV is believed to be caused by protons, whose trajectories

are bend by cosmic magnetic fields by several degrees. Lack of knowledge about these fields makes it difficult to account for the deflections while at highest energies, where the deflections are believed to be small, low statistics of the cosmic rays prevents one from making definite conclusions.

Secondly, the angular resolution of the cosmic-ray experiments is very poor by the astronomical standards. The most precise ground array, AGASA, has an average error of 1.8° in determination of the arrival directions at the highest observed energies, and 2.5° at $E \sim 10^{19}$ eV [1]. As a result, an impressive number of astrophysical objects fall in the error box of each particular cosmic ray. The situation improved with the availability of the first set of the HiRes stereo data [2] with claimed angular resolution of 0.6° . Still, this resolution is quite poor for direct identification: dozens of optical, radio and X-ray sources are contained in a given circle of 0.6° radius on the Celestial sphere.

With these complications, statistical methods give the only possible clue to search for positional correlations between the cosmic rays and their potential sources. An excess of cosmic rays at small angular distances (in particular, at those compared to the experiment's angular resolution) from objects of a certain class may suggest that this class of objects contains more probably the sources of these cosmic rays than other classes, which do not exhibit such an excess.¹

Many astrophysical sites have been suggested which can host an accelerator powerful enough to produce particles with $E \sim 10^{19}$ eV and higher. Most of them are extragalactic (which is consistent with the lack of global galactic anisotropy of the arrival directions of high-energy cosmic rays). Various cosmic accelerators may operate by similar mechanisms, so the most efficient way to distinguish between them is based on direct positional correlations. Up to now, the correlations with different classes of objects were studied by different methods, with different data sets, or were not studied at all. This work aims at filling this gap and calculating the chance probabilities of the claimed correlations by a uniform method, which allows to compare the strength of correlations and to figure out more probable sources among those suggested previously.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. In Sec. 2, we discuss the logic of the statistical analysis of correlations, describe the methods we use and emphasize several subtle points. Sec. 3 lists potential astrophysical sources, briefly recalls motivations for these candidates and previous correlation studies. For each class of sources, we give here references for the catalogs we use in the current study. In Sec. 4, we present the results of the correlation studies for several representative samples of cosmic rays. The conjectures about positional correlations were formulated on the basis of the cosmic rays observed by AGASA, and sometimes by the Yakutsk experiment. We use the samples of cosmic rays with energies $4 \cdot 10^{19} < E < 10^{20}$ eV observed by AGASA (49 rays) and by AGASA and Yakutsk (59 rays)

¹The background of random coincidences is always present, and one cannot claim that one particular object is a source of a given cosmic ray based on these statistical arguments only.

to treat the suggested sources uniformly and to reformulate the conjectures. We consider independently neutral and proton primaries and in the latter case, we account for proton deflection in the Galactic magnetic field. Then, we test the same conjectures with recently published HiRes stereoscopic data (271 cosmic ray with $E > 10^{19}$ eV), assuming only neutral primaries, since energies of the HiRes events are unpublished. Finally, we look for correlations of suggested sources with the cosmic rays of the highest ($E > 10^{20}$ eV) energies. Sec. 5 contains conclusions and discussion.

2 The correlation analysis

The general logic of the correlation studies by statistical methods is to test the hypothesis that the distribution of the observed arrival directions of the cosmic rays is *isotropic*, and that there is no excess of the cosmic rays at small angular distances² from the sources listed in a given catalog (and *not* to test the hypothesis that the sources from the list emit cosmic rays). To this end, a large number of cosmic-ray events are simulated which arrive at the Earth isotropically. Some part of them is "accepted", following the same rules which determine the acceptance of a given cosmic-ray experiment. The angular distances between the simulated events and the astrophysical objects from the catalog are calculated and their distribution is compared to the distribution of distances between the real cosmic rays and the same objects. The less the probability that the real distribution is a statistical fluctuation of one calculated for isotropic cosmic rays, the stronger the indication that the objects from that particular list may be the cosmic-ray sources.

Another way of reasoning might be to simulate the positions of the sources and to compare them with real cosmic rays, or to simulate both. However, the distribution of the objects of a particular class in the Universe follows specific laws and is not easy to be simulated. The selection biases of discovery, observation, and inclusion in catalogs add more to this problem. On the other hand, the directional acceptance of the cosmic-ray detectors is quite well understood and the distribution of the observed cosmic rays agrees with the theoretical acceptance reasonably well. That is why we simulate the cosmic rays and not the sources.

To compare the real and simulated distributions of angular distances, we follow a conventional procedure used in correlation studies. One takes a catalog of n_r cosmic rays observed by a given experiment and calculates the number $\nu(\delta)$ of events falling within the angular distance δ from the suggested sources. The value of δ should be of order of the experiment's angular resolution. The actual value at which the real effect is better seen may be determined by simulations described in Ref. [3] for AGASA and Yakutsk and in Ref. [4] for HiRes stereo. In all cases, the simulation gives the value of δ somewhat larger than the angular resolution. The reason for this smoothing is quite clear: a significant part of the observed cosmic rays is not related to known sources included in catalogs. The Monte Carlo code

²That is, at those of order of the experimental angular resolution.

generates then a random direction in the visible half of the Celestial sphere, determined by the azimuth angle A and the zenith angle Z , as well as the sidereal time of the event arrival, s . Then the code either accepts (with the probability $P(A, Z, s)$) or rejects the event. The procedure is repeated until N sets, each of n_r accepted events, are generated, where N is large: we use $N = 10^4$ sets in our study except for the cases of a very strong signal when we use $N = 10^5$. For the ground arrays, the probability $P(A, Z, s) = \cos Z$; for the HiRes experiment in stereo mode, $P(A, Z, s) = P_A(A)P_Z(Z)P_s(s)$ and the functions P_A, P_Z, P_s are given in Ref. [5]. For each mock set $i = 1, \dots, N$, the quantity $\nu_i(\delta)$ is calculated. The probability that the observed distribution of cosmic rays with respect to the sources is a fluctuation of a random distribution is estimated (for each particular pair of samples of cosmic rays and astrophysical objects) simply by

$$\mathcal{P} = \frac{\text{number of mock sets with } \nu_i(\delta) \geq \nu(\delta)}{N}.$$

It is worth noting that the value of $\mathcal{P}$ should not be, in general, interpreted as the statistically correct probability if subsequent tries with different catalogs were made (see Sec. 4.3) and if the purpose of a study is to test the null-hypothesis that there are no positional correlations between cosmic rays and any of the astronomical catalogs considered.

For the cosmic-ray experiments with relatively good angular resolution, and assuming charged primaries, the signal may be smeared out by deflections in the magnetic fields. One may attempt to correct the arrival directions for bending in the Galactic magnetic field (GMF), assuming a particular GMF model. In this study, when applicable, we assume the GMF model used in Ref. [6] and proton-like primaries (electric charge $+1$). The knowledge of particle energies is crucial for the correction for GMF and 30% errors in energy determination may result in additional increasing of the value of δ . All simulated events are subject to the same correction as the real ones; to this end, the MC code assigns randomly the energies of n_r observed events to n_r simulated events in each of N mock sets.

The cuts imposed by hand on the samples of cosmic rays and possible sources may result in essential lowering of the probability $\mathcal{P}$. One may impose these cuts a posteriori, to maximize the signal, and to compensate the probability by a penalty factor (see, for instance, Ref. [3]). In this study, we do not impose any *additional* cuts on the catalogs taken from original works. All cuts in astronomical catalogs (e.g. the $z < 0.01$ cut in a sample of Seyfert galaxies or several cuts in a sample of dead QSO candidates, see Sec. 3) were made *in the original works* where these candidate objects had been suggested. We refer the reader to these works for motivation of the cuts. In the catalogs of cosmic rays, the cuts in energies and zenith angles were made a priori as well and were determined by the availability of data. We note here that making cuts which maximize the signal is very useful for further detalization of the class of cosmic-ray emitters but postpone this subject to subsequent studies.

One subtle point in this kind of a study concerns the value of the bin size δ . The probability $\mathcal{P}$ depends strongly on δ (see plots in Sec. 4). Hence, choice of δ may be considered

as a cut which requires its own penalty factor. However, varying δ at scales smaller than the angular resolution of a detector, one can easily obtain strong unphysical correlations: one single coincidence within 0.1° of a source and a cosmic ray observed by a detector with the angular resolution of 2° results in a drop of $\mathcal{P}$ of order $(0.1/2)^2 = 2.5 \cdot 10^{-3}$ compared to one coincidence within 2° , while physically the two cases have the same meaning (see Fig. 3 in Sec. 4.4). Account of the correlations of this kind in simulated sets may result in strong overestimation of the penalty factor if one chooses to determine δ a posteriori to maximize the signal and then to compensate for this choice by introducing penalties. In this study, we fix δ a priori following the simulations of Refs. [3, 4]. These values are of order of the experiment’s angular resolution: $\approx 2.5^\circ$ for AGASA (2.8° for AGASA with GMF correction)³ and $\approx 0.8^\circ$ for HiRes stereo. We will see that in the cases when a strong signal is seen, the minimal $\mathcal{P}$ often corresponds to a different but close value of δ .

Since we are interested in a comparative study of various astrophysical sources only, hence in *relative* values of probabilities, and not in testing a hypothesis that the objects of a particular class emit cosmic rays, this approach is sufficient for our purposes. However, a more adequate method to obtain *absolute* values of probabilities should avoid the choice of δ at all. Indeed, there exist statistical methods to compare distributions without use of explicit binning. Probably the best known one is the Kolmogorov-Smirnov (KS) test; however, in our case it is not applicable for two reasons. Firstly, the KS test does not account for the value of experimental errors. Secondly, its sensitivity to differences between distributions close to the end points of the interval at which the distributions are determined is very poor, while the positional correlations appear at values of the angular distances compared to the detector’s resolution and much less than the maximal possible angular distance of 180° , that is very close to the zero end point of the interval $[0^\circ, 180^\circ]$. One may attempt to cut the interval at some angle Δ in order to shift the effect towards the center of the interval; we checked that the result is very sensitive to Δ in this case. Methods other than the KS test exist which are more sensitive at the ends of an interval, but, as, for instance, the Anderson-Darling method, they are directly implemented only for the simplest distributions. As a result, this approach awaits further studies.

3 Potential sources

Various classes of potential astrophysical accelerators are discussed, for instance, in Ref. [7]. We tried to include in this study all sources mentioned in the literature as candidate sources of ultra-high-energy cosmic rays, subject to two criteria: we require the objects to be persistent (gamma-ray bursts are excluded in this way) since the comparison of significance can hardly be performed between persistent sources and flares, and we consider only extragalactic objects since no galactic anisotropy is seen with the impressive statistics of events

³We use the same values for the AGASA-dominated joint samples of cosmic rays.

at $E > 10^{19}$ eV. For the case of *unidentified* gamma-ray sources, to safely exclude Galactic populations, we require the galactic latitude $|b| > 10^\circ$. For comparison, we present also results without this cut.

3.1 Flat spectrum radio quasars

Powerful active galactic nuclei, where particles can be accelerated up to extreme energies, are often considered as the best astrophysically motivated sources of energetic cosmic rays. The significant correlations ($\mathcal{P} = 5 \cdot 10^{-3}$) of the highest-energy (at least one standard deviation above $8 \cdot 10^{19}$ eV) events observed by Fly’s Eye, AGASA and Haverah Park and published before 1998 with flat-spectrum radio-loud quasars (FSRQs) were first claimed in Ref. [8] and considered as an argument in favour of GZK-violating new composite particles. Since then, these correlations were reanalyzed in various papers [9, 10] with different results. The original sample consisted of quasars from the Bonn catalog [11] of radio sources with 5 GHz flux exceeding 1 Jy and radio spectral index $\alpha > -0.5$. We considered both the original sample and the sample selected by the same criteria from the new 11th edition of the Véron catalog of quasars [12].

Catalog 1: Kuehr FSRQs

Original catalog: Kuehr et. al., 1981 [11].

Cuts: class=QSO, spectral index $\alpha > -0.5$.

Number of objects: 201.

Catalog 2: Véron FSRQs

Original catalog: Véron-Cetty and Véron 2003 [12], Table 1 (quasars).

Cuts: 6 cm flux $F_6 > 1$ Jy, spectral index $\alpha > -0.5$ (calculated from fluxes at 6 and 11 cm).

Number of objects: 211.

3.2 Seyfert galaxies

This subclass of active galaxies was considered in Refs. [13] where physical motivations were discussed and correlations (with the probability of chance coincidence as low as $2 \cdot 10^{-5}$) with AGASA and Yakutsk cosmic rays with energies $E > 4 \cdot 10^{19}$ were claimed for several samples with fine-tuned cuts in the galactic latitude. In Ref. [13], the catalog [14] and the 10th edition of Véron catalog [15] were used and the distance cut $z < 0.01$ was imposed. We use both the catalog [14] and the updated Véron catalog [12] with the same cut.

Catalog 3: Lipovetsky Seyferts

Original catalog: Lipovetsky et. al. [14].

Cuts: $z < 0.01$.

Number of objects: 136

Catalog 4: Véron Seyferts

Original catalog: Véron-Cetty and Véron 2003 [12], Table 3 (active galaxies)

Cuts: classification starts with S (all Seyferts), $z < 0.01$.

Number of objects: 190.

3.3 BL Lac type objects

Active galaxies often have jets fueled by the nuclei and consisting of relativistic plasma fired in strongly collimated cones. When one of the jets is directed towards the observer, this galaxy is seen as a blazar. These objects are naturally considered as good candidates for the sources of the cosmic rays which reached the Earth. BL Lac type objects constitute a subclass of blazars distinguished by their spectral properties. Different authors use different criteria for this distinction. In particular, one may either require the absence of the emission lines or put a constraint on their width. These criteria are discussed, for instance, in Ref. [16] and are implemented in the catalog [12] where Table 2 contains both confirmed BL Lac's in the strict sense of the word and possible BL Lac's, notably those classified as high-polarization (HP) blazars.

The first claim for correlation of cosmic rays with confirmed BL Lac's ($\mathcal{P} \sim 6 \cdot 10^{-5}$) was made [3] for the maximally autocorrelated sample of cosmic rays detected by the AGASA and Yakutsk experiments. The sample of BL Lacs was chosen from the 9th edition of the Véron catalog [17] by the cuts on the visual magnitude, the radio flux and the redshift. The sample was chosen in such a way that the signal was maximized; cited probability includes the penalty factor for cut adjustment [3].

As discussed below (see Sec. 3.8), gamma-ray emission should accompany emission and propagation of UHECR. It was observed indeed that the BLL which correlate with UHECR in the resulting subsample of Ref. [3] are classified as EGRET sources in astronomical databases. Imposing the single criterion – positional coincidences of objects in Véron [15] and EGRET [22] catalogues – leaves 14 objects and this subsample also exhibits very low formal values of $\mathcal{P} \sim 3 \cdot 10^{-7}$ with the maximally autocorrelated set of UHECR [18]. It is difficult to calculate the significance here since the set of 14 BLL overlaps with previous set of 22 BLL of Ref. [3]. For our comparative study we have chosen one of these subsamples (the other one shows very similar values of $\mathcal{P}$ in all tests we carry). Namely, we have chosen single physical criterion of BLL being the EGRET source for our catalog selection. This condition is more transparent and is easier to implement with updated most recent catalogue of AGN [12], which we use uniformly throughout our comparative study.

A much more general sample of objects — all confirmed BL Lac's brighter than 18^m from the 10th edition [15] of the Véron catalog — was used, with a positive result, for the searches

for correlations with all published AGASA events (see Refs. [6, 19, 20]). In particular, it has been noted [6] that the account of the GMF improves the correlations.

Very recently, the correlations of all three previously selected samples of the BL Lac type objects were tested [4] with the HiRes stereo data with the positive result – probability $\mathcal{P} = 4 \cdot 10^{-4}$ – for the sample [6, 19, 20] of bright ($m < 18$) confirmed BL Lac’s.

The correlations with BL Lacs were reported also in Ref. [21].

For this study, we use the updated catalog [12] and do not impose any new cuts. We consider separately ”strict” and high-polarization BL Lac’s. We also consider the subsamples of the new catalog [12] selected by the criteria of Refs. [6] and [18]. The results for the old [15, 17] and new [12] catalogs are similar.

Catalog 5: Confirmed Véron BL Lac’s

Original catalog: Véron-Cetty and Véron 2003 [12], Table 2 (BL Lac type objects).

Cuts: classification=BL (confirmed BL Lac’s).

Number of objects: 491.

Catalog 6: HP Véron BL Lac’s

Original catalog: Véron-Cetty and Véron 2003 [12], Table 2 (BL Lac type objects).

Cuts: classification=HP (high-polarization BL Lac’s)

Number of objects: 68.

Catalog 7: Bright confirmed Véron BL Lac’s

Original catalog: Véron-Cetty and Véron 2003 [12], Table 2 (BL Lac type objects).

Cuts: classification=BL (confirmed BL Lac’s), visual magnitude $m < 18$.

Number of objects: 178.

Catalog 8: Possible EGRET BL Lac’s

Original catalog: Véron-Cetty and Véron 2003 [12], Table 2 (BL Lac type objects).

Cuts: classification=BL (confirmed BL Lac), angular distance to the nearest source from the 3EG catalog [22] less than $2r_{95}$, where r_{95} is the angular radius of the circle containing the same solid angle as the 95% confidence contour of that EGRET source.

Number of objects: 30.

3.4 Radio galaxies

Often intrinsically as luminous as blazars, similar objects seen at large angles to the jet appear much fainter and are called radio galaxies. Their classification has been introduced in Ref. [23]; the FR I type galaxies are thought to be the counterparts of the BL Lac’s while more powerful FR II type objects may be the counterparts of other blazars. The lobes (clouds of matter fueled by the jets) and the hot spots (regions where the jet hits the lobe)

of FR II type galaxies are efficient acceleration sites [24]. According to simple estimates (see, for instance, Ref. [25]), the hot spots are the only known places in the Universe where protons can be accelerated to energies higher than 10^{20} eV by shock acceleration. The shocks move in various directions, the magnetic fields in the source are very strong and, as a result, the accelerated particles may escape the accelerator not necessarily along the jet. We are not aware of any previous correlation searches for the radio galaxies. Here, we use a catalog of radio galaxies with their FR classifications published in Ref. [26].

Catalog 9: FR I radio galaxies

Original catalog: Zirbel and Baum [26], Table 11.

Cuts: classification=I or Ig (confirmed FR I).

Number of objects: 73.

Catalog 10: FR II radio galaxies

Original catalog: Zirbel and Baum [26], Table 11.

Cuts: classification=II, IIg, IIIn, or IIId (confirmed FR II).

Number of objects: 116.

3.5 Colliding galaxies

Regions of strong shocks are obviously present in merging galaxy systems. Based on this fact and on several positional correlations (without a detailed statistical analysis), nearby colliding galaxies were suggested as possible sources of the highest-energy cosmic rays (see, for instance, Refs. [1, 27]). Our sample consists of objects classified as “pair in contact” in the latest update of the Vorontsov-Velyaminov catalog of interacting galaxies [28].

Catalog 11: Colliding galaxies

Original catalog: Vorontsov-Velyaminov et. al. [28].

Cuts: classification starts with PK (pair in contact).

Number of objects: 454.

3.6 Starburst and luminous infrared galaxies

In a region of large-scale star formation (a starburst region), a strong shock wave may develop which provides the conditions required for the efficient particle acceleration. Two-step acceleration process in these regions may result [29] in nuclei energies of 10^{20} eV and higher. When two colliding galaxies finally merge, they may produce an active starburst region near the common center; this appears to the observer as a luminous infrared galaxy (LIG). The possibility that the latter can be a source of highest-energy cosmic rays has been discussed in Ref. [30]. Given a large number of sources, the correlation study was possible

only in the sense that the large-scale distribution of cosmic rays and LIGs are correlated; these studies did not give definitive results [30, 31]. In Ref. [7], the most probable candidates among LIGs were pointed out: those listed in the PDS [32] and HCN [33] catalogs. It has been pointed out in Ref. [7] that it is worth considering the list of Ref. [34] in correlation studies. The latter list consists of those LIGs for which the expected gamma-ray flux (calculated in Ref. [34]) exceeds the sensitivity limit of GLAST, a future gamma-ray telescope. Though it is not perfectly clear why this particular GLAST-related cut is important for *ultra-high-energy* cosmic ray production, we include the sample of Ref. [34] in our study together with the PDS and HCN samples.

Catalog 12: PDS starbursts

Original catalog: The Pico dos Dias Survey [32], Table 1.

Cuts: no.

Number of objects: 203.

Catalog 13: HCN luminous infrared galaxies

Original catalog: HCN survey [33], Table 1.

Cuts: no.

Number of objects: 53.

Catalog 14: Selected luminous galaxies

Original catalog: HCN [33] and PDS [32] surveys, compiled in Ref. [34].

Cuts: calculated in Ref. [34] expected gamma-ray flux exceeds the GLAST sensitivity.

Number of objects: 16.

3.7 Dead quasar candidates in luminous nearby galaxies.

The observation of the cosmic rays with extremely high energies, at which the propagation length of a particle is limited due to its interaction with the cosmic background radiation, suggested that their sources should be located in the neighborhood of our Galaxy. Since no objects, powerful enough, are explicitly seen at these distances, it has been proposed that the highest-energy cosmic rays may be accelerated in quasar remnants which do not emit strong radiation observed by astronomical, in particular radio, telescopes [35, 36]. A typical feature of a source of this kind is an extremely heavy black hole in the nuclei of an elliptic galaxy. In Ref. [35], a list of possible candidate sources has been suggested; we included it in our study. According to a refined study of Ref. [37], a typical dead quasar candidate which has chances to correlate with the observed cosmic rays should satisfy the following criteria:

- 1) absolute magnitude $M_{\text{abs}} < -21$;
- 2) redshift $z < 0.01$;
- 3) morphological type $t < -3$ (elliptical);

- 4) galactic latitude $|b| > 20^\circ$;
- 5) the object belongs to a group with richness not exceeding 50.

The authors of Ref. [37] applied these five cuts to the Nearby Optical Galaxy catalog [38]. The resulting sample consisted of 12 objects. We did not succeed in reproducing their catalog of 12 objects by the same procedure, probably due to the fact that the cut (5) is quite vague and Ref. [37] used unpublished data for its implementation. In our study, we skipped this cut and left only first four. We applied them to the LEDA database [39] which is more complete than Ref. [38]. Still, not all 12 objects of Ref. [37] entered the resulting sample. Taking the original 12-object sample, we reproduced the results for the AGASA experiment (without the GMF correction) presented in Ref. [37]. This sample exhibits no correlations either upon account of the GMF or with the HiRes data.

Catalog 15: dead QSO candidates from Ref. [35]

Original catalog: sample of nearby galaxies with massive dark objects, Ref. [40].

Cuts: central object mass $M > 10^9 M_\odot$.

Number of objects: 14.

Catalog 16: dead QSO candidates with cuts of Ref. [37]

Original catalog: LEDA database [39].

Cuts: $M_{\text{abs}} < -21$, $z < 0.01$, $t < -3$, $|b| > 20^\circ$.

Number of objects: 23.

3.8 Gamma ray sources

Both acceleration of particles and their propagation through the cosmic background radiation are accompanied by emission of energetic photons. These photons, in turn, lose energy in interactions with background photons [41] and arrive at the Earth with energies of order 100 MeV – 100 GeV, that is in the range observed by the EGRET instrument. Hence, the gamma-ray emission is very probable to accompany the cosmic ray emission (see, for instance, Refs. [18, 42, 43]). The TeV emission has been suggested as a characteristic feature of the AGNs which accelerate protons up to highest energies but are quiet in other energy ranges, analogues of the “dead quasars” [44].

Correlations of the blazars present among the *identified* sources in the Third EGRET catalog [22] were studied in Ref. [10] with a negative result. Most of the EGRET blazars are strong sources of the FSRQ or HP type (see Sec. 3.1, 3.3). In Ref. [18], strong correlations ($\mathcal{P} \sim 10^{-4}$) were found between the sample of AGASA and Yakutsk cosmic rays and *unidentified* EGRET sources. An important ingredient for these correlations was the inclusion of the GMF correction. Another correlating sample of EGRET sources studied in Ref. [18] consisted of 14 sources which have a confirmed BL Lac nearby (see Catalog 8 in Sec. 3.3).

Here, we separately study the samples of EGRET sources (i) identified as confirmed AGNs in the 3EG catalog and (ii) unidentified (outside the Galactic plane). We also include a sample of GeV sources laying outside the Galactic plane and a small sample of extragalactic TeV sources. For comparison, we present the results for unidentified EGRET and GeV sources without the galactic latitude cut.

Catalog 17: EGRET blazars

Original catalog: The 3rd EGRET catalog [22].

Cuts: identification=A (confirmed AGN).

Number of objects: 67.

Catalog 18: Unidentified EGRET sources outside the Galactic plane

Original catalog: The 3rd EGRET catalog [22].

Cuts: identification void, galactic latitude $|b| > 10^\circ$.

Number of objects: 96

Catalog 18a: Unidentified EGRET sources

Original catalog: The 3rd EGRET catalog [22].

Cuts: identification void.

Number of objects: 170

Catalog 19: GeV sources outside the Galactic plane

Original catalog: Lamb, Macomb [45].

Cuts: galactic latitude $|b| > 10^\circ$.

Number of objects: 26

Catalog 19a: GeV sources

Original catalog: Lamb, Macomb [45].

Cuts: no.

Number of objects: 52.

Catalog 20: Extragalactic TeV sources

Original catalog: List of confirmed TeV sources presented in Ref. [46].

Cuts: identification with extragalactic objects⁴.

Number of objects: 10.

⁴The only TeV source present in the list of Ref. [46] and lacking firm identification is most probably Galactic and is not included.

Sample	Experiments	Energies	Reference	Number of cosmic rays	Notes
A	AGASA	$(4 \dots 10) \cdot 10^{19}$ eV	[1]	49	
A+Y	AGASA, Yakutsk	$(4 \dots 10) \cdot 10^{19}$ eV	[1], [47]	59	1
H	HiRes stereo	$> 10^{19}$ eV	[2]	271	2
20+	All Northern experiments	$> 10^{20}$ eV	See Ref. [48]	13	3

Table 1: The cosmic-ray samples. *Notes:* 1) The updated sample of events observed by the Yakutsk array before 1995 with zenith angles less than 45° . 2) The arrival directions were published in the form of a PS plot in Hammer projection; the energies of the events are unpublished, so the correction for the GMF is not possible. 3) The sample is described in detail in Ref. [48].

4 Results

For the catalogs described in Sec. 3, we estimated, as described in Sec. 2, the probability that the observed number of cosmic-ray events close to the astrophysical objects is a fluctuation of the random distribution.

4.1 Cosmic-ray samples

The samples of cosmic rays we use are determined mostly by the availability of data. Most of the previous studies were based on AGASA and (sometimes) Yakutsk events. The HiRes stereo sample became recently available. Motivated by the fact that several experimental groups published only the data on the events with energies higher than 10^{20} eV and keeping in mind the possibility that the “sub-GZK” and “super-GZK” events may originate in different classes of objects, we consider separately the events with $E \gtrsim 10^{20}$ eV. We describe the cosmic-ray sets in Table 1.

4.2 Results of the comparative study

The values of the probability $\mathcal{P}$ calculated following Sec. 2 are presented in Table 2. One can make following conclusions out of these Tables.

1. At present, cosmic rays with $E > 10^{20}$ eV do not correlate with any astrophysical objects. This does not exclude, however, any real connection because of low statistics.
2. The strongest correlations seen in AGASA and Yakutsk datasets at energies below 10^{20} eV are exhibited by the catalogs 3, 5, 7, 8 and 18.

Catalog	A	A *	A+Y	A+Y *	H	20+
1 (FSRQ)	0.23	1.00	0.20	0.88	0.69	0.73
2 (FSRQ)	0.95	0.98	0.96	0.92	0.28	1.00
3 (Sy)	0.70	0.013	0.45	0.038	0.86	1.00
4 (Sy)	0.69	0.62	0.79	0.78	0.40	0.74
5 (BL)	0.17	0.024	0.29	$2.9 \cdot 10^{-3}$	0.040	0.98
6 (BL)	0.59	0.56	0.44	0.77	0.078	0.48
7 (BL)	0.027	<u>$4 \cdot 10^{-4}$</u>	0.051	<u>$7 \cdot 10^{-4}$</u>	<u>$5 \cdot 10^{-4}$</u>	0.87
8 (BL)	$7.4 \cdot 10^{-3}$	0.20	$2.9 \cdot 10^{-3}$	0.027	0.54	1.0
9 (RG)	0.56	0.56	0.58	0.46	1.00	0.49
10 (RG)	0.89	0.34	0.95	0.48	0.63	0.68
11 (coll.)	0.27	0.15	0.069	0.099	0.55	0.50
12 (LIG)	0.089	0.47	0.18	0.27	0.80	0.22
13 (LIG)	0.11	0.87	0.18	0.11	0.30	0.41
14 (LIG)	0.086	0.18	0.13	0.090	0.24	1.00
15 (dQSO)	1.00	0.17	1.00	0.22	1.00	1.00
16 (dQSO)	0.41	1.00	0.50	1.00	1.00	0.13
17 (γ)	0.24	0.68	0.14	0.80	0.20	0.46
18 (γ)	0.10	$5.1 \cdot 10^{-3}$	0.16	<u>$1.2 \cdot 10^{-3}$</u>	0.62	1.00
18a (γ)	0.24	0.015	0.37	$5.8 \cdot 10^{-3}$	0.82	0.61
19 (γ)	0.27	0.31	0.34	1.00	0.40	1.00
19a (γ)	0.19	0.39	0.095	0.50	0.52	1.00
20 (γ)	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.012	1.00

Table 2: Probability $\mathcal{P}$ calculated for the catalogs of astrophysical objects described in Sec. 3 and the samples of cosmic rays described in Sec. 4.1. For convenience, with the number of a catalog, a reference to a section of this paper is given as follows: FSRQ – Sec. 3.1, Sy – Seyfert galaxies – Sec. 3.2, BL – BL Lac’s – Sec. 3.3, RG – radio galaxies – Sec. 3.4, coll. – colliding galaxies – Sec. 3.5, LIG – starburst and luminous IR galaxies – Sec. 3.6, dQSO – dead QSO candidates – Sec. 3.7, γ – gamma-ray sources – Sec. 3.8. The columns with the results obtained with correction of the arrival directions for GMF are marked by asterisks. The values of $\mathcal{P} < 4.6 \cdot 10^{-2}$ (which would correspond to a 2σ effect for the Gaussian statistics) are given in bold face. The values $\mathcal{P} < 2.7 \cdot 10^{-3}$ (would-be 3σ) are underlined. Each value of $\mathcal{P}$ has been calculated without accounting for other tries and thus can be interpreted as a relative probability with respect to other catalogues.

- (a) The effect in Catalog 3 (Lipovetsky Seyferts) is dominated by 5 sources close to the direction of the AGASA triplet. These sources contribute 8 out of 13 observed coincidences with AGASA cosmic rays within 2.8° . The effect is not present for a sample of Seyfert galaxies from the Vèron catalog. The correlations are observed with the account of the correction for GMF only.
 - (b) The correlations of Catalog 5 (all confirmed BL Lac's) and Catalog 7 (bright confirmed BL Lac's) with AGASA and Yakutsk cosmic rays are improved with the correction for GMF.
 - (c) The Catalog 8 represents an update of the sample of Ref. [18] of BL Lac's which are possibly associated with EGRET sources. It contains 30 objects, compared to 14 original. The values of probabilities presented here are higher compared to those given in Ref. [18]. The difference is due to the fact that for the comparative study, we use here different sets of cosmic rays. With the update 30-objects catalog and the same maximally autocorrelated sample of cosmic rays as used in Ref. [18], we obtain the results very similar to those presented there for the 14-object sample.
 - (d) Strong correlations of cosmic rays observed by the ground arrays are seen with unidentified EGRET sources (catalog 18) outside the Galactic plane. Generally, correlated sources were detected neither in GeV nor in TeV. The physical properties of the correlated sources and their identification require further study. The correlations with unidentified EGRET sources persist even when a large Galactic population is included (Catalog 18a). Note in passing that on the base of the correlations with 14 BL Lac objects associated with EGRET sources it was suggested [18] that at least some of the unidentified EGRET sources, correlated with UHECR, are BL Lac type objects still unobserved in other wave bands.
3. Results on AGASA and (AGASA+Yakutsk) samples are consistent with each other.
 4. The corrections for the deflection in GMF are important. A full test of the correlations found in the AGASA and Yakutsk data with the new HiRes stereo data will be possible only after publication of the energies of HiRes events. One should note however that the poor knowledge of the GMF results in errors in corrected arrival directions which exceed the angular resolution of the HiRes experiment in the stereo mode, so the effect, if present, may be smoothed considerably.
 5. Only BL Lac type objects (catalogs 5, 7) exhibit correlations both with the HiRes stereo data set and the AGASA-dominated samples. This fact is very interesting and deserves further discussion; see also Sec. 4.3. To the correlations of HiRes cosmic rays with the TeV sources (catalog 20), two objects contribute, and both are BL Lacs. Other catalogs are not, however, rejected. For instance, the correlations with unidentified gamma-ray

sources are mostly seen for the proton primaries when the deflection of arrival directions in GMF were taken into account; a similar analysis for the HiRes sample is impossible at the moment because the energies of the cosmic rays are unpublished. Moreover, the angular resolution of HiRes stereo is better than uncertainties both in the positions of the EGRET sources (which means that the ultra-high-energy astronomy is actually possible) and in the corrections for GMF.

4.3 Significance of multiple tries

When the purpose of a study is to estimate the probability that some particular class of objects is related to a sort of events (UHECRs in our case), multiple tries of various catalogs are not welcome. Just by chance, one expects the probability of order $1/M$ to be found among M independent catalogs of objects tested for correlations with a single cosmic-ray sample. Thus, a factor of M is usually required as a penalty in this case. When the tries are not independent, the penalty factor is more difficult to estimate. The purpose of our study is, however, purely comparative: we test the conjectures made in previous works by a uniform method. To compare the probabilities, we thus do not care about any general factor by which all the numbers should be multiplied, and this penalty factor in particular.

On the other hand, one notices that quite low $\mathcal{P}$ are found for the Catalog 7 with the cosmic rays observed by different experiments. While this is not our main goal, one may wonder how probable is to obtain $\mathcal{P} \leq 7 \cdot 10^{-4}$ in *independent* experiments just by chance. In this way, one would test the hypothesis that there are no catalogs correlating with UHECR samples among all we list and all the correlations seen are nothing but statistical fluctuations due to multiple tries. We performed a simple estimative simulation to this end. We took the declinations of objects present in our 21 catalogs and randomized the right ascensions many times. In this way, we obtained 32000 sets, each of 21 catalog with the same numbers of objects and the same distributions in declination as the real ones. All $21 \cdot 32000 \approx 7 \cdot 10^5$ simulated catalogs were subject to the same procedure as the real catalogs. Only in one case, a simulated catalog exhibited $\mathcal{P} \leq 7 \cdot 10^{-4}$ for the HiRes sample and one of four other (interdependent) samples simultaneously. We thus estimate the probability that the results for the Catalog 7 are a result of a chance fluctuation as $1/32000 \approx 3 \cdot 10^{-5}$.

4.4 Dependence on δ

As it has been already noted, the values of the bin sizes we fixed for the calculation of $\mathcal{P}$ were determined by simulations. In some cases, lower values of $\mathcal{P}$ were obtained for other choices of δ . In figures 1 and 2, we present the δ dependence of $\mathcal{P}$ for two interesting cases: unidentified EGRET sources with AGASA and Yakutsk cosmic rays and BL Lac's with HiRes cosmic rays. For comparison, we present on the same plots the $\mathcal{P}(\delta)$ dependence for a typical catalog which does not exhibit any correlation. An example of the effect described




Figure 1: $\mathcal{P}(\delta)$ for catalog 18 (unidentified EGRET sources outside the Galactic plane, lower (red) curve) and catalog 4 (nearby Véron Seyferts, upper (green) curve), cosmic-ray sample A+Y (AGASA and Yakutsk), correction for GMF included.




Figure 2: $\mathcal{P}(\delta)$ for catalog 7 (bright confirmed BL Lac's, lower (red) curve) and catalog 4 (nearby Véron Seyferts, upper (green) curve), cosmic-ray sample H (HiRes stereo).




Figure 3: Curve with a shallow minimum (green): $\mathcal{P}(\delta)$ for catalog 9 (colliding galaxies), sample A, GMF included. The dip at $\delta = 0.3^\circ$ is probably unphysical and diminishes for $\delta = 2.8^\circ$ expected from the experiment angular resolution. Curve with deeper minimum (red): catalog 20 (extragalactic TeV sources), sample H. For this sample, $\mathcal{P}(0.2^\circ) < 10^{-4}$ while physically meaningful $\mathcal{P}(0.8^\circ) \sim 10^{-2}$.

in Sec. 2 – a random coincidence at very small angles – is presented at Fig. 3.

5 Conclusions

We performed a comparative study of correlations between the arrival directions of the cosmic rays observed by AGASA, Yakutsk and HiRes experiments with 21 catalogs of astronomical objects suggested by different authors as possible UHECR sources. No a posteriori cuts were imposed on the catalogs. The results are described in Sec. 4.2 but should be interpreted with great care because the angular resolution of the cosmic-ray experiments is poor, cosmic magnetic fields are known not quite well and the statistics is not overwhelming.

The analysis of the AGASA and Yakutsk samples demonstrates the presence of correlations with unidentified EGRET sources, BL Lac’s and nearby Seyfert galaxies. The corrections for the Galactic magnetic field are very important for these effects.

Only BL Lac type objects exhibit correlations with the HiRes stereo sample as well. With the uncut catalog of 491 confirmed BL Lac’s and the set of 271 cosmic rays with energies $E > 10^{19}$ eV, we obtained the probability of 0.04 for these correlations to result from a random coincidence. For the updated catalog of 178 bright ($m < 18$) BL Lac’s, the probability is as low as $5 \cdot 10^{-4}$. For the AGASA sample (with the GMF correction),

$\mathcal{P} = 4 \cdot 10^{-4}$ for the same catalog; for AGASA and Yakutsk $\mathcal{P} = 7 \cdot 10^{-4}$. The probability that one of 21 catalogs exhibits, by chance, $\mathcal{P} \leq 7 \cdot 10^{-4}$ both for the HiRes sample and one of four other samples is about $3 \cdot 10^{-5}$. The correlations are present at the angular distances of order HiRes angular resolution and much less than the expected deflections of charged particles in cosmic magnetic fields. This suggests that a fraction of the cosmic-ray flux at energies $E > 10^{19}$ eV is carried by neutral primaries [4].

Clearly, more detailed information about the cosmic rays observed by HiRes would be very important for understanding the effects discussed here. Knowledge of the energies of particles would allow to reconstruct (to some accuracy) their deflections in the Galactic magnetic field. A study of shower profiles might help to understand what kind of neutral particles may be present in the cosmic rays and contribute to correlations. Finally, if, for example, a neutral primary is a photon emitted by a blazar, the arrival time of the corresponding air shower may coincide with a temporary change in the state of the source. This would give much stronger support to conjectures about particular cosmic-ray sources than the statistical studies of the arrival directions.

Further detailed study will specify which particular physically distinguished subclasses of BL Lac's and other objects correlate strongly with the cosmic rays and will give quantitative predictions for the future experiments, in particular for the Pierre Auger Observatory.

Acknowledgements

The authors are indebted to P. Tinyakov who shared with them his code which was used to calculate the probabilities with the correction for GMF and to check other results for the ground arrays. We thank D. Semikoz, P. Tinyakov and I. Tkachev for numerous helpful discussions and reading of the manuscript. We thank M. Pravdin and I. Sleptsov for sharing with us the updated catalog of Yakutsk events. S.T. thanks *Service de Physique Théorique, Université Libre de Bruxelles*, for warm hospitality at different stages of the work, supported in part by the IISN (Belgium), the *Communauté Française de Belgique* (ARC), and the Belgium Federal Government (IUAP). This study was supported in part by the INTAS grant 03-51-5112, by the Young scientists of the Russian Academy of Sciences Project # 35, by the RFBR grant 02-02-17398, by the grants of the President of the Russian Federation NS-2184.2003.2, MK-2788.2003.02 (D.G.), MK-1084.2003.02 (S.T.), by the Swiss Science Foundation, grant 20-67958.02, by the grants of the Russian Science Support Foundation and by the fellowships of the "Dynasty" foundation (awarded by the Scientific Council of ICFPM).

References

- [1] N. Hayashida *et al.*, arXiv:astro-ph/0008102.
- [2] R. U. Abbasi *et al.* [The High Resolution Fly's Eye Collaboration (HIRES)], *Astrophys. J. Lett.* **610**, L73 (2004) [arXiv:astro-ph/0404137].
- [3] P. G. Tinyakov and I. I. Tkachev, *JETP Lett.* **74**, 445 (2001) [*Pisma Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz.* **74**, 499 (2001)] [arXiv:astro-ph/0102476].
- [4] D. S. Gorbunov *et. al.*, *JETP Lett.* **80**, 145 (2004) [*Pisma Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz.* **80**, 167 (2004)] [arXiv:astro-ph/0406654].
- [5] B. T. Stokes, C. C. H. Jui and J. N. Matthews, *Astropart. Phys.* **21** (2004) 95 [arXiv:astro-ph/0307491]; Springer R W, 2003, *Stereo spectrum of UHECR showers at the HiRes detector*, presentation at the 29th ICRC, Tsukuba.
- [6] P. G. Tinyakov and I. I. Tkachev, *Astropart. Phys.* **18**, 165 (2002) [arXiv:astro-ph/0111305].
- [7] D. F. Torres and L. A. Anchordoqui, *Rept. Prog. Phys.* **67** 1663 (2004) [arXiv:astro-ph/0402371].
- [8] G. R. Farrar and P. L. Biermann, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **81** (1998) 3579 [arXiv:astro-ph/9806242].
- [9] A. Virmani *et.al.*, *Astropart. Phys.* **17** (2002) 489 [arXiv:astro-ph/0010235].
- [10] G. Sigl *et. al.*, *Phys. Rev. D* **63** (2001) 081302 [arXiv:astro-ph/0008363].
- [11] H. Kuehr *et. al.*, *Astron. Astrophys. Suppl.* **45** (1981) 367.
- [12] M. P. Véron-Cetty and P. Véron, *Astron. Astrophys.* **412** (2003) 399.
- [13] A. V. Uryson, *J. Exp. Theor. Phys.* **89**, 597 (1999) [*Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz.* **116**, 1121 (1999)]; A. V. Uryson, arXiv:astro-ph/0303347.
- [14] V. A. Lipovetsky, S. I. Neizvestny and O. M. Neizvestnaya, *Comm. SAO* **55** (1988).
- [15] M. P. Véron-Cetty and P. Véron, *Astron. Astrophys.* **374** (2001) 92.
- [16] M. P. Véron-Cetty and P. Véron, *Astron. Astrophys. Review* **10** (2000) 81.
- [17] M. P. Véron-Cetty and P. Véron, *ESO Scientific Report no. 19* (2000).
- [18] D. S. Gorbunov *et. al.*, *Astrophys. J. Lett.* **577**, L93 (2002) [arXiv:astro-ph/0204360].
- [19] P. Tinyakov and I. Tkachev, arXiv:hep-ph/0212223.

- [20] P. Tinyakov and I. Tkachev, arXiv:astro-ph/0305363.
- [21] Uryson A V, *Results of identification of UHECR sources*, 2001 *Proc. 27th ICRC (Hamburg)* 551
- [22] R. C. Hartman et.al., *Astrophys. J. Suppl.* **123** (1999) 79.
- [23] B. L. Fanaroff and J. M. Riley, *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **167** (1974) 31P.
- [24] J. P. Rachen and P. L. Biermann, *Astron. Astrophys.* **272** (1993) 161 [arXiv:astro-ph/9301010].
- [25] The Pierre Auger Observatory Technical Design Report, <http://www.auger.org/admin/DesignReport/index.html>
- [26] E. R. Zirbel and S. A. Baum, *Astrophys. J.* **448** (1995) 521.
- [27] S. S. Al-Dargazelli *et. al.*, *J. Phys. G* **22** (1996) 1825.
- [28] B. A. Vorontsov-Velyaminov, R. I. Noskova and V. P. Arkhipova, *The Catalogue of Interacting Galaxies*, <http://www.sai.msu.su/sn/vv/>
- [29] L. A. Anchordoqui, G. E. Romero and J. A. Combi, *Phys. Rev. D* **60** (1999) 103001 [arXiv:astro-ph/9903145].
- [30] A. Smialkowski, M. Giller and W. Michalak, *J. Phys. G* **28**, 1359 (2002) [arXiv:astro-ph/0203337].
- [31] W. Bednarek, *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **331**, 483 (2002) [arXiv:astro-ph/0112008].
- [32] R. Coziol et.al., *Astrophys. J. Suppl.* 119 (1998) 239.
- [33] Y. Gao and P. M. Solomon, *Astrophys. J. Suppl.* **152** (2004) 63 [arXiv:astro-ph/0310341].
- [34] D. F. Torres et.al., *Astrophys. J. Lett.* **607** (2004) L99.
- [35] E. Boldt and P. Ghosh, *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **307** (1999) 491 [arXiv:astro-ph/9902342];
- [36] E. Boldt and M. Loewenstein, *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **316** (2000) L29 [arXiv:astro-ph/0006221].
- [37] D.F. Torres et.al., *Phys. Rev. D* **66** (2002) 023001 [astro-ph/0204419].
- [38] G. Giuricin et.al., *Astrophys. J.* **543** (2000) 178.
- [39] HyperLeda database, <http://www-obs.univ-lyon1.fr/hypercat/>

- [40] J. Maggorian *et. al.*, Astron. J. **115** (1998) 2285.
- [41] V. S. Berezinsky *et. al.*, *Astrophysics of cosmic rays*, Amsterdam: North Holland (1990);
P. S. Coppi and F. A. Aharonian, Astrophys. J. **487** (1997) L9 [arXiv:astro-ph/9610176].
- [42] C. Ferrigno, P. Blasi and D. De Marco, arXiv:astro-ph/0404352.
- [43] D. Fargion and A. Colaiuda, arXiv:astro-ph/0409022.
- [44] A. Neronov, P. Tinyakov and I. Tkachev, arXiv:astro-ph/0402132.
- [45] R. C. Lamb and D. J. Macomb, Astrophys. J. **488**, 872 (1997).
- [46] T. C. Weekes, highlight talk at ICRC 2003.
- [47] M. I. Pravdin and I. E. Sleptsov, private communication.
- [48] D. S. Gorbunov and S. V. Troitsky, JCAP **0312**, 010 (2003) [arXiv:astro-ph/0306145].